

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

DAVE HYDOCK,)	CASE NO. 1:24-cv-1486
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE CHARLES ESQUE FLEMING
)	
v.)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE
)	JAMES E. GRIMES JR.
HENANSHENGTOUYOUSHANGM)	
AOYOUXIANGONGSI, <i>et al.</i> ,)	ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE’S
)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
Defendants.)	

On August 29, 2024, Plaintiff Dave Hydock filed a complaint against Defendants Henanshengtousyoushangmaoyouxiangongsi d/b/a Touyoo and Does 1-10, alleging, *inter alia*, claims for trademark and copyright infringement. (ECF No. 1). On September 10, 2024, Plaintiff Dave Hydock filed “Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application For Entry Of Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, And Order Restraining Transfer Of Assets And Incorporated Memorandum of Law” (the “TRO Motion”). (ECF No. 6). On September 12, 2024, Magistrate Judge Grimes issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that the Court deny the TRO Motion without prejudice. (ECF No. 8). The R&R also gave the parties notice of the 14-day time limit for filing objections.¹ (*Id.* at PageID #112). The deadline has passed and no objections have been filed.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, a district court must conduct a *de novo* review of those portions of the R&R to which the parties have objected. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Absent objection, a district court may adopt an R&R without further review. *See Peretz v. United States*, 501 U.S. 923, 939 (1991); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 141–42 (1985).

¹ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2) provides that the parties may object to a Magistrate Judge’s R&R within 14 days after service.

There being no objections, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Grimes's R&R, incorporates it fully herein by reference, and **DENIES** the TRO Motion (ECF No. 6) **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 30, 2024

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Charles E. Fleming".

CHARLES E. FLEMING
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE